Appendix E

Example Transmittal/Approval Letters

DOE F 1320.5
(08-93)

United States Government — **Department of Energy**

memorandum

DATE: April 2, 1999

REPLY TO ATTN OF: Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance:Jessee:202/586-7600

SUBJECT: Approval of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS)(DOE/EIS-0247)

TO: Martha A. Krebs
Director
Office of Science

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health has reviewed the subject Final EIS in accordance with our responsibilities under Department of Energy Order 451.1A regarding compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, as requested in your March 11, 1999, memorandum. Based on my staff's review and recommendations, and after consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the Final EIS is adequate for publication and distribution subject to incorporation of the attached comments. At a meeting with your staff on March 12, 1999, and in subsequent telephone conversations, the Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance and General Counsel staff discussed our major comments and reached agreement on their resolution.

The Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance will continue to assist your Office in filing the Final EIS with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other distribution matters. Please have your staff direct any questions to Jim Daniel at 202/586-9760.

David Michaels, PhD, MPH
Assistant Secretary
Environment, Safety and Health

Attachment

cc: David Wilfert, SC-111, NEPA Document Manager
Clarence Hickey, SC-8.2, NEPA Compliance Officer

Printed on recycled paper

Appendix E
Example Transmittal Memos

Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

July 19, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY

THROUGH: Ernest J. Moniz
Under Secretary

FROM: David Michaels, PhD, MPH
Assistant Secretary
Environment, Safety and Health

SUBJECT: ACTION: Approve the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the High Flux Beam Reactor (HFBR) Transition Project, Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL), NY (DOE/EIS-0219D)

ISSUE: The Office of Science has submitted the Draft EIS for the HFBR Transition Project for approval. (Summary attached.) The Draft EIS evaluates four alternatives: (1) the **No Action Alternative** (maintaining HFBR in a shutdown and defueled condition); (2) **Resume Operation Alternative** with two subalternatives: operate at 30 Megawatts (MW) and at up to 60 MW; (3) **Resume Operation and Enhance Facility Alternative** (operate at 60 MW with upgrades); and (4) **Permanent Shutdown Alternative**. The Draft EIS analyses indicate no significant impacts to public health or the environment under any of the four alternatives.

The Department of Energy (DOE) needs to make a decision regarding the future of the HFBR. The reactor was shut down for refueling in December 1996. Before it could be restarted, DOE discovered tritium contamination in the groundwater downgradient from the HFBR.

DOE's "Action Plan for Improved Management of Brookhaven National Laboratory" (July 1997) states that the Secretary of Energy will decide the future of the HFBR and directs an appropriate environmental review process. That process consists of this EIS, which incorporates the results of the ongoing tritium remediation project.

The Conference Report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998, while prohibiting the use of funds for restarting HFBR, also called for DOE to prepare an EIS. The funding prohibition for the restart of HFBR was reaffirmed in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999. The draft Fiscal Year 2000 Senate Energy and Water Development Bill, section 604, again prohibits using any funds for the restart of the HFBR.

Appendix E
Example Transmittal Memos

There is considerable controversy regarding the future of HFBR. Several stakeholders, including Standing for Truth About Radiation (STAR) and the Community Alliance for Laboratory Accountability (CALA), object to the restart of HFBR due primarily to concerns about tritium contamination of Long Island's sole source aquifer. However, there is support from the scientific community, including the Basic Energy Science Advisory Committee, for HFBR to be restarted because of the continuing need for neutron research. There is also support for restart from local civic and business organizations. Following completion of remediation, analyses conducted in the EIS indicate that the tritium level in the groundwater at the site boundary would be significantly below the national and the State of New York drinking water standards, and any contribution of tritium to the groundwater from BNL in general and HFBR in particular would be insignificant. An independent review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission concluded that the tritium plume does not present a radiological hazard to public health and safety. In addition, the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, which operates HFBR for the Office of Science, indicates its confidence that the reactor can be restarted and operated in a safe and cost-effective manner.

The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR 1502.14) require that the Department must specify a preferred alternative in a draft EIS if it has one at the time of publication. The HFBR Draft EIS does not currently identify a preferred alternative, although the No Action, and the Resume Operation and Enhance Facility Alternatives, are identified as non-preferred.

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health, in consultation with the Office of General Counsel, believes the Draft EIS is adequate, subject to incorporation of comments that have been provided to SC staff. The Office of General Counsel believes that there is a high likelihood that the Final EIS will be challenged in court should the DOE decide to restart HFBR.

A communications plan is attached.

NEXT STEPS: After approval, the Draft EIS will be printed, distributed, and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. A 90-day public comment period is planned. Public hearing(s) are also planned to be held in the vicinity of BNL.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Secretary approve the Draft EIS.

Approve: _____

Disapprove: _____

Date: _____

Concurrences: General Counsel/Dennison 6/22/99; Nuclear Energy/Magwood 6/22/99
Office of Science/Krebs 6/21/99; Congressional & Intergovernmental Affairs/Angell 7/16/99

DOE F 1325.8
(8-89) (EFG 07-90)
United States Government — Department of Energy

memorandum

DATE: September 17, 1998

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: Energy Research

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Spallation Neutron Source Project

TO: Peter N. Brush, Acting Assistant Secretary
Office of Environment, Safety and Health

I am forwarding for Office of Environment, Safety and Health (EH) approval, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) project. I also request that your office coordinate with and obtain concurrence on this document from the Office of the General Counsel (GC), and upon approval, arrange to have the Notice of Availability (NOA) published in the Federal Register. A draft of the NOA will be provided to your office after Energy Research has received comments from EH and GC. In this regard, staff from EH-42 and GC-51 have been involved in the NEPA process for this proposed action and have received courtesy copies of this DEIS.

Energy Research would appreciate your help in approving this DEIS to meet the SNS project's schedule for an issuance of the document by October 16, 1998, for a 45-day public comment period. To that end, the SNS EIS Document Manager and members of my staff would like to meet with EH-422 at DOE Headquarters on September 30, 1998, to discuss and resolve any comments on this DEIS. While realizing that EH-422 has also agreed to informally review the preliminary DEIS for the High Flux Beam Reactor Transition Project, ER requests that the DEIS for SNS receive first priority within EH.

The Energy Research points of contact on this matter are the Energy Research NEPA Compliance Officer, Clarence Hickey (3-2314), and the SNS Program Manager, Jeff Hoy (3-4924).

Martha Krebs

Martha A. Krebs
Director
Office of Energy Research

Attachment

cc:
D. Wilson, Energy Research
J. Carney, Energy Research
W. Dennison, General Counsel
A. Watkins, Oak Ridge Operations
D. Wilfert, Oak Ridge Operations
M. Butler, Brookhaven Area Office
E. Colton, Los Alamos Area Office
A. Gabel, Argonne Area Office

memorandum

DATE: SEP 15 1998

REPLY TO ATTN OF: Energy Research

SUBJECT: ACTION: Transmit Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) Project

TO Martha A. Krebs, Director
Office of Energy Research

ISSUE: Submission of the predecisional internal draft of the SNS EIS to EH requesting review and approval for public release by October 16, 1998.

SENSITIVITIES: Short turnaround is being requested for EH review and approval in order to issue a Record of Decision for siting the SNS in April 1999, which is already over a month behind schedule.

In addition, you should be aware that there are a few sensitive issues associated with the four alternative SNS sites. These are briefly summarized below by site:

Oak Ridge Alternative Site (Preferred Option)

First and foremost, there have been no significant environmental or public health impacts identified that would lead to shifting the preferred option from Oak Ridge to one of the three other alternative sites. The Chestnut Ridge location at the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) was selected through a rigorous screening process that aimed to avoid environmentally sensitive areas and minimize potential impacts. Chestnut Ridge, however, does have some relatively minor environmental issues that are addressed in the EIS:

- Greenfield versus Brownfield Site

  Some members of the public around Oak Ridge (including one who has written anonymous letters, to the Vice President among others) have voiced objections about siting SNS on Chestnut Ridge because of its pristine condition and proximity to the Walker Branch Watershed Research Area (see next bullet). The initial siting study of ORR candidate locations found that there were no brownfield sites large enough to accommodate the 110 acre footprint of the SNS. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor site, mentioned in the anonymous letters, was considered and rejected because DOE does not own it. This issue is addressed in the EIS (Appendix B), and ORO and ORNL are prepared to respond to any public comments on it.

- Interference with the Walker Branch Watershed Research Area

  The Chestnut Ridge site is within the better zone designed to protect the Walker Branch Watershed - a long-term environmental research area which is located about 1.5 km away. Atmospheric research is being conducted there by ORNL and NOAA. Although construction and operation of the SNS will probably interfere to some degree with this research, ORO and ORNL have been in working with NOAA to find ways to mitigate these impacts.

- Radiological Effects

  While the EIS has not identified any significant environmental or public health effects from operating SNS at Oak Ridge, SNS operations would double the calculated dose to the maximally exposed individual at ORR from 0.45 mrem to 0.82 mrem for SNS operations at 1 MW, and quadruple the dose to 2.0 mrem for 4 MW operation. The analysis of potential accidents has identified 25 scenarios that would be expected to release radioactivity to the atmosphere. The quantities of radioactive materials that could be released in the majority of those scenarios are so small that no worker or member of the public would be expected to receive a dose of more than 0.001 mrem. One postulated beyond design basis accident is calculated to deliver a maximum dose of 1,600 mrem to a member of the public and 1,800 mrem to a worker.

- Wetlands

  Construction of SNS will require using 0.14 acre of wetlands, plus the potential to temporarily affect other adjacent wetlands. A wetlands assessment process is being combined with the NEPA process. The result of the wetlands assessment and a statement of findings will be included in the Record of Decision.

Los Alamos Alternative Site

- Groundwater and Drinking Water

  Water for all uses by the SNS at the LANL site would come from groundwater. The EIS estimates that the increased load on the groundwater resources due to placement of the SNS at LANL could impact water levels and create competition with private and local water users for water resources. Additionally, the incremental demand of SNS operations likely would exceed the maximum delivery capacity of the water distribution system.

- Electric Power

  The electric power system serving LANL is currently operating near capacity, and future projections on electric power use from LANL already indicate that demand will exceed capacity. The incremental addition of SNS to the existing electric system would be problematic.

- Radiological Effects

  No significant radiological impacts have been identified for siting and operating of the SNS at LANL. The total dose from LANL to the maximally exposed individual has been estimated in the current LANL Draft Site-Wide EIS to range from 1.88 - 5.44 mrem/yr. via the air pathway, while the offsite population dose is estimated to range from 11 - 33 person-rem/yr. This range is dependent on the alternatives analyzed in the LANL EIS. Operating SNS at LANL would increase these doses to 5.66 mrem/yr. and 42.4 person-rem/yr.

Argonne Alternative Site

- Wetlands and Floodplains

  Construction of the SNS at ANL would result in the destruction of 3.5 acres of wetlands. Mitigation would probably require ANL to create new wetlands to replace those lost. This would be similar to the measures taken to compensate for wetlands destroyed during construction of the APS. The Army Corps of Engineers monitored the success of that wetlands replacement effort over a five year period, and they judged it to be unsuccessful (for which ANL received a Notice of Violation). Hence, any future wetlands replacement efforts at ANL would probably receive close scrutiny by the Corps of Engineers. In addition, the location of SNS at ANL would encroach on portions of the 100-yr floodplain and require alterations of drainage patterns, which would in turn have to be analyzed for conformance to floodplain regulations.

- Construction and Environmental Restoration

  Earthmoving for construction of the SNS would potentially destroy several solid waste management units. Without remediation prior to SNS construction, contamination could be spread to uncontaminated areas. Realistically, construction at ANL would have to be significantly delayed until these environmental restoration concerns could be addressed.

- Radiological Dose Increases

  While no significant radiological impacts have been identified for siting the SNS at ANL, its operation would increase the doses received by the public by an order of magnitude or more. The total dose from ANL to the maximally exposed individual currently is estimated to be 0.053 mrem/yr via the air pathway; while the offsite population dose is 2.64 person-rem/yr. Addition of the SNS (operating at 1 MW) would increase these doses to 1.8 mrem and 47 person-rem respectively. A 4 MW SNS facility would increase the doses to 6.6 mrem/yr and 190 person-rem/yr respectively, an incremental increase of about two orders of magnitude. While these are small doses, the increases in the total site generated doses would be relatively large.

Brookhaven Alternative Site

- Groundwater Activation

  At BNL, the SNS would be situated near the northern end of the site near RHIC, and on top of the sole source Long Island Upper Glacial Aquifer. Its operation would result in activated soil and groundwater in the areas surrounding the linac tunnel. The levels of activated groundwater are expected to be very small, with only limited effects for groundwater quality in the immediate vicinity of SNS. Although no offsite effects or consequences are foreseen, some members of the local community are likely to object to siting another radiological facility at BNL.

  Due to the proximity of SNS and RHIC, the potential exists for the commingling within groundwater of radionuclides from the two facilities. While this is not expected to be a significant impact and no offsite effects are predicted, the cumulative impact analysis in the EIS discusses RHIC and HFBR. The DOE Brookhaven Group is concerned that this may draw undesirable attention to those facilities by the local community during the public comment phase of the SNS EIS process.

  Lastly, it is possible that the SNS EIS and the HFBR Transition Project EIS may be distributed for public review within a short time of each other. This will tend to draw further public attention to radiological matters at BNL.

- Radiological Dose Increases

  No significant radiological impacts have been identified for operating SNS at BNL. The total dose from BNL to the maximally exposed individual is estimated to be 0.06 mrem/yr via the air pathway, while the offsite population dose is estimated to be 3.2 person-rem/yr. Operating SNS at 1 MW there would increase these doses to 0.67 mrem and 33 person-rem, respectively. Operations at 4 MW would increase the doses to 2.6 mrem and 130 person-rem. While these doses are still quite small, they will probably be viewed unfavorably by critics in the local community.

Appendix E
Example Transmittal Memos

RECOMMENDATION: That you sign the attached memorandum to Peter Brush, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Environment, Safety and Health.

Patricia M. Dehmer
Associate Director of Energy Research
for the Office of Basic Energy Sciences

Attachment

cc:
D. Wilson, Energy Research

memorandum

DATE: November 25, 1998

REPLY TO ATTN OF: Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (Jessee:202-586-7600)

SUBJECT: Spallation Neutron Source Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0247)

TO: Martha A. Krebs
Director
Office of Science

This is in response to your September 17, 1998, memorandum requesting approval of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Spallation Neutron Source (DOE/EIS-0247).

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health has reviewed and commented on the draft environmental impact statement, in accordance with our responsibilities under Department of Energy Order 451.1A, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance Program. My staff has worked with your staff, the Office of General Counsel and the Oak Ridge Operations Office in a concurrent review process. On September 30, 1998, my staff met with SC and Oak Ridge staff to discuss major issue comments. Oak Ridge provided a revised draft document to us on November 13, 1998, which responds to many of those comments. Further revisions were provided on November 23. The Spallation Neutron Source NEPA Document Manager has committed to accommodate our comments on the November draft of the document. Based on the review of my staff and after consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the draft environmental impact statement is adequate for publication and distribution, subject to your acceptance and accommodation of comments we and the Office of General Counsel have provided to your staff through today.

The Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance will continue to assist your Office in filing the draft environmental impact statement with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other distribution matters. Please direct any questions to Jim Daniel, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance at 202-586-9760.

Peter N. Brush
Acting Assistant Secretary
Environment, Safety and Health

cc: Clarence Hickey, NEPA Compliance Officer, Office of Science
Jeff Hoy, SNS Program Manager, Office of Science
Dave Wilfert, NEPA Document Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office

DOE F1325.8
(08-89) (EFG 07-90)

United States Government **Department of Energy**

memorandum

DATE: DEC 18 1998

REPLY TO ATTN OF: SC-10

SUBJECT: ACTION: Transmit Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the High Flux Beam Reactor (HFBR) Transition Project

TO: Martha A. Krebs, Director
Office of Science

ISSUE: Submission of the predecisional internal draft of the HFBR EIS to EH requesting review and approval for public release by January 22, 1999.

SENSITIVITIES: The Secretary made a public commitment to decide the future of the HFBR in June 1999. Completion of the HFBR EIS process is required to support this decision.

STATUS: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the High Flux Beam Reactor (HFBR) Transition Project is being prepared for the Office of Science (SC) by the DOE Brookhaven Group (BHG). BHG has hired a contractor to assist in the hands-on writing of the DEIS. The contractor is one of the DOE pre-approved contractors with experience in the preparation of NEPA documents. A pre-approval version of the DEIS was provided to the Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) by BHG on December 10 for final review, prior to SC submitting it to EH with a request to issuance the DEIS for public review and comment. The DEIS is being sponsored by SC, with involvement of the Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) which has concurred in the SC submittal to EH. Previous staff-level working versions of the DEIS have been reviewed by SC and NE, with cooperation and input from both the Office of Environment, Safety and Health (EH) and the Office of General Counsel (GC).

ISSUES BEING REVIEWED: The current version of the DEIS appears to be responsive to the technical comments and concerns that have been raised by all of the involved parties up to this point. The DEIS, however, is not well crafted in terms of the presentation of the assessments and results in a manner that will be easily read and understood by the local Long Island stakeholder community. The assessments of the issues of prime interest to the community are scattered throughout the DEIS and need to be centralized and explained in language that is useful and meaningful to the lay readers. Of particular importance in this regard are the assessments of the many releases and emissions of tritium, as well as the presentation of the accident analysis for the beyond design basis (BDB) scenario. This BDB accident is very close in probability to a design basis accident, and has substantial offsite health consequences. This needs to be discussed more carefully, thoroughly, and in more understandable lay language. We are working closely with EH, NE, BHG and its contractor to expeditiously resolve these issues.

Appendix E
Example Transmittal Memos

SCHEDULE: The schedule for preparation and completion of the EIS process has been driven by the BNL Action Plan's call for public involvement to inform the Secretarial decision on the future of the HFBR. Last fall Secretary Richardson informed the Long Island community that he would make the decision on the future of the HFBR in June 1999. That would mean that the EIS process would have to be complete in May 1999 so that a Record of Decision (ROD) could be issued in June. The Secretary made that pronouncement based on the EIS schedule as it existed then. Since that time, the EIS review process identified a need to update the probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) to reflect the current HFBR configuration to support the accident analysis in the DEIS. That set the schedule back approximately five weeks. Based on that and on the recent experience with preparation, review, and approval of the Draft EIS for the Spallation Neutron Source, BES has estimated that a realistic schedule for completion of the HFBR EIS would be for issuance of a Final EIS in July 1999, followed by the ROD in August 1999. Our best estimate of the schedule is attached.

This schedule change does not represent a delay in the EIS or a breaching of the Secretary's pronouncement of June 1999 as the completion date. It represents an aggressive schedule to prepare a competent environmental analysis for a controversial project, the decision for which will be public, politically sensitive, and the subject of potential litigation following the ROD. The extension of the schedule to accommodate a thorough analysis will be protective of the Department, the Long Island public, and the environment.

ACTIONS NEEDED BY SC MANAGEMENT: To date, the involved parties (SC, NE, EH, GC, BHG) all have worked collaboratively and corporately toward the preparation of the HFBR DEIS. The fact that SC-1 has been communicating with the Deputy Secretary on this matter has provided valuable impetus for the collaborative approach to date. Nothing more at this level seems warranted at this time.

Formal submission of the DEIS to EH-1 with a request for review and approval of the DEIS by the end of January 1999 would support a public comment period that would extend from March 1 through April 12, 1999. According to the BNL Action Plan, SC-1 is expected to make a recommendation to the Secretary on which of the four alternatives (see below) the Department should propose for the future of the HFBR. The DEIS by design does not propose any preferred alternative, it merely assesses the environmental consequences all four alternatives equally. By regulation, the Final EIS must declare the Department's preferred option. This means that between the close of the public comment period (i.e., April 12, 1999) and the HQ approval of the Final EIS (mid-June 1999), SC must secure a decision from the Secretary on which alternative will be declared in the final EIS.

BACKGROUND: On December 21, 1996, the HFBR was shut down for refueling and maintenance, a routine activity which normally occurred almost every month. Before the reactor could return to scheduled scientific operations, however, monitoring indicated that a plume of tritiated water was contaminating the groundwater in excess of drinking water standards south and down gradient of the reactor. DOE, in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), New York State Department of Conservation (NYSDEC), and Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS), immediately initiated activities to identify and eliminate the source of the tritium plume. These activities were completed in January,1998. The source of the groundwater contamination has been eliminated. Additional CERCLA activities continue as part of the Department's commitment to remediate the contaminated groundwater.

The Department of Energy needs to make a decision regarding the future of the HFBR at BNL. This EIS will aid DOE in its decisionmaking process. In July 1997, the Department issued its "Action Plan for Improved Management of Brookhaven National Laboratory," which summarized the Department's planned process for deciding the future of the HFBR. The Action Plan states that the Secretary of Energy will decide the future of the HFBR and directs an appropriate environmental review process. That review process consists of this EIS on the HFBR, which will incorporate the results of the tritium remediation project in conjunction with the ongoing CERCLA process. The Draft EIS does not contain a preferred alternative for the future of the HFBR, but will analyses equally the four alternative courses of action listed below.

The Secretary must decide upon a preferred alternative for the future of the HFBR in for inclusion in the Final EIS. As stated in the Action Plan, that decision will take into account several factors, including: public input from the local Long Island community; input from the HFBR scientific user community and the DOE Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee; and the value of the scientific information produced using the HFBR.

The alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS reflect the full range of options available for the future of the HFBR:

- **No Action Alternative.** Under this alternative, the reactor would be maintained in the current shutdown and defueled condition for the indefinite future. The Department regards this as a non-preferred alternative, because it does not resolve the future of the HFBR.

- **Resume Operation Alternative.** Under this alternative, the Department would restart the HFBR for scientific research. This alternative includes two subalternatives:

  a. Startup and operation of the reactor at a power level of 30MW (the power level prior to the shutdown).

  b. Startup and operation of the reactor at a power level of 30MW with a planned increase in operation at a level of up to 60MW at which HFBR has previously operated.

  The earliest date that the reactor could be restarted is April 2000, following completion of the NEPA process and all of the modifications and repairs required for full environmental compliance.

- **Resume Operation and Enhance Facility Alternative.** Under this alternative, the Department would restart the reactor for operation at a power level of up to 60MW, and eventually replace the reactor vessel to extend the life of the reactor, and upgrade the reactor (e.g., add scientific instruments) to enhance the reactor's scientific research capabilities and increase the number of potential reactor users. Because of budget limitations, the Department regards this as a non-preferred alternative.

United States Government — Department of Energy

memorandum

DATE: December 22, 1998

REPLY TO ATTN OF: Office of Science

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the High Flux Beam Reactor

TO: David Michaels, Assistant Secretary for
Environment, Safety and Health

I am forwarding for Office of Environment, Safety and Health (EH) review and approval, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the High Flux Beam Reactor (HFBR) Transition Project. I also request that your office coordinate with and obtain concurrence on this document from the Office of the General Counsel (GC), and upon approval, arrange to have the Notice of Availability (NOA) published in the Federal Register. A draft of the NOA will be provided to your office after the Office of Science has received comments from EH and GC. In this regard, staff from EH-42 and GC-51 have been involved in the NEPA process for this proposed action and have received courtesy copies of this DEIS. We have incorporated comments received from EH and GC including those from the October 5 and 6 working meeting.

The Office of Science would appreciate your help in approving this DEIS by January 22, 1999, to support a 45-day public comment period which would begin March 1, 1999. To that end, the HFBR EIS Document Manager and members of my staff would like to meet with EH-42 in early January 1999, to discuss and resolve any comments EH may have on this DEIS.

The Science points of contact on this matter are the Science NEPA Compliance Officer, Clarence Hickey (3-2314), and the HFBR Program Manager, Stan Staten (3-4950). The Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology point of contact is NEPA Compliance Officer, Rajendra Sharma (3-2899).

Martha A. Krebs
Director
Office of Science

Attachment
Draft EIS for HFBR

cc:
B. Weakley, SC -4
R. Lange, NE-40
C. Borgstrom, EH-42
W. Dennison, GC-52
G. Malosh, Brookhaven Group Office
M. Holland, Brookhaven Group Office